



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/725,088 | 12/01/2003 | Karl-Friedrich Laible | 2001P14020WOUS | 1754 |
| 46726 7590 04/28/2009 BSH HOME APPLIANCES CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 100 BOSCH BOULEVARD NEW BERN, NC 28562 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| TRAN, HANH VAN | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 3637 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 04/28/2009 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/725,088

Applicant(s)

LAIBLE, KARL-FRIEDRICH

Examiner

HANH V. TRAN

Art Unit

3637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 19-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 10-15, 19-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5108)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is the Final Office Action from the examiner in charge of this application in response to applicant's amendment dated 1/27/2009.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 3 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The limitations in claim 3 are already recited in claim 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 15, since applicant has clearly stated that claim 1 is intended to be drawn to the subcombination of a guide assembly, the positive recitation of the sidewalls; and at least one pair of guide rails being mounted in a region of the sidewalls renders the claim indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-5, 10-15, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DE 29817743.

DE '743 discloses a cold goods container comprising a cooling apparatus having an open front side, at least one pullout shelf, and sidewalls diverging in a direction of the front side, a guide assembly comprising at least one pair of guide rails 31-32 guiding the pullout shelf at least partway out of the cold goods container through the open front side; and a plurality of compensating element 34-37 provided to each of said guide rails for mounting at least one guide rail of each of said pair of guide rails at one of the sidewalls at an acute angle to the sidewall, said angle being defined to extend said rails of said pair of guide rails parallel to one another, wherein said compensating elements are mirror-symmetrical, wherein said compensating element is formed at said guide rail in one piece and integral with said guide rail, said guide rail has a C-shaped cross-section with a top leg, a bottom leg, and a center piece joining said top and bottom legs; and said compensating element is formed in said center piece, said compensating element has a contact surface adjoining the sidewall; and said guide rail carries, on said contact surface of said compensating element, at least one hook 35,37 protruding through an opening 21-22 of the sidewall, such as shown in Fig 4, wherein: the sidewalls have ribs; and said at least one pair of guide rails are mounted in a region of said sidewalls without the ribs, wherein the guide assembly comprising a C-shaped cross-section with a top leg, a bottom leg, and a center piece joining said top and bottom legs, said compensating element being formed at said center piece.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DE 29817743 in view of USP 6,641,239 to Kaiser.

DE '743 discloses all the elements as discussed above except for the compensating element is wedge shaped and extends substantially over an entire length of the guide rail.

Kaiser teaches the idea of providing a cooling apparatus with a pair of guide rails, such as shown in Figs 2 & 6, wherein each guide rail comprises a compensating element having a wedge shaped and extends substantially over an entire length of the guide rail, such as shown in Fig 6, for the purpose of compensating for at least one oblique position of the pullout shelf/storage compartment. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the structure of DE '743 by providing the compensating element with

a wedge shaped that extends substantially over an entire length of the guide rail for the purpose of compensating for at least one oblique position of the pullout shelf/storage compartment, as taught by Kaiser, since both teach alternate conventional cooling apparatus structure, used for the same intended purpose, thereby providing structure as claimed.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 1/27/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument on page 6 that compensating elements 34-37 of DE '743 for to meet the claimed limitation of "configured to mount...parallel to one another", the examiner respectfully takes the position that the claimed language fails to provide adequate structural limitation in defining/describing the compensating elements in order to distinguish from the prior art of record. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

11. In response to applicant's argument on page 6 that Kaiser is not qualified as a prior art because the present application entitled to a priority filing of 6/1/2001, the examiner respectfully takes the position that Kaiser is entitled to the filing date of PCT/EP99/09793 having a filing date of 12/10/1999 and German Patent Application 19858387 of 12/8/1998.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HANH V. TRAN whose telephone number is (571)272-6868. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, and alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (571) 272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HVT
April 27, 2009

/Hanh V. Tran/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3637